



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
08/520,079	08/28/1995	SHUNPEI YAMAZAKI	740756-1400	1321

22204 7590 05/10/2011
NIXON PEABODY, LLP
401 9TH STREET, NW
SUITE 900
WASHINGTON, DC 20004-2128

EXAMINER

KIM, JAY C

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

2815

MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE
-----------	---------------

05/10/2011

PAPER

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

Office Action Summary	Application No. 08/520,079	Applicant(s) YAMAZAKI ET AL.	
	Examiner JAY C. KIM	Art Unit 2815	

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) OR THIRTY (30) DAYS, WHICHEVER IS LONGER, FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 18 June 2010.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 87,88,90,123,124 and 126 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 87,88,90,123,124 and 126 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 28 August 1995 is/are: a) ☒ accepted or b) ☐ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☒ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☒ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
1. ☒ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
2. ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
3. ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413) |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 3) <input type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO/SB/08) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application |
| Paper No(s)/Mail Date _____ | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

This Office Action is in response to After-Final Amendment filed June 18, 2010.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 112

1. The following is a quotation of the second paragraph of 35 U.S.C. 112:

The specification shall conclude with one or more claims particularly pointing out and distinctly claiming the subject matter which the applicant regards as his invention.

2. Claims 88 and 124 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 112, second paragraph, as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which applicant regards as the invention. Regarding claims 88 and 124, it is not clear whether Applicants claim that "each of said crystalline semiconductor islands of said first and second thin film transistors" further "comprises a material selected from the group consisting of Fe, Co, Ni, Ru, Rh, Pd, Os, Ir, Pt, Cu, Ag, Au" in addition to "nickel" recited in claims 87 and 123. Because if that is the case, it is not clear what it is to further comprise "Ni" (in claims 88 and 124) in addition to the nickel in claims 87 and 123, and Applicants did not originally disclose adding nickel and another element other than nickel for crystallization.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

3. The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

Art Unit: 2815

4. Claims 87, 88, 90, 123, 124 and 126 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Fonash et al. (US 5,275,851) in view of Sakamoto (US 5,650,664).

Regarding claim 87, Fonash et al. disclose a semiconductor device (Fig. 1) comprising a thin film transistor over a substrate (Glass substrate) comprising a crystalline semiconductor island (col. 2, lines 40-41 and 63-66, and col. 3, lines 1-6), source and drain regions in the crystalline semiconductor island (col. 3, lines 22-27), a channel forming region (center portion of Poly Si) between the source and drain regions, a gate insulating film (SiO_2) adjacent to at least the channel forming region, and a gate electrode (Gate) adjacent to the channel forming region having the gate insulating film therebetween, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the thin film transistor is formed in a monodomain region which contains no grain boundary, because the nickel layer 12 is formed at a bottom surface of an amorphous silicon layer to crystallize the amorphous silicon layer and can be patterned as isolated islands (col. 3, lines 1-6) and thus would not have grain boundaries shown in Fig. 2 of current Application, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the thin film transistor includes nickel, because nickel in the nickel layer 12 would diffuse into the amorphous silicon layer during annealing to crystallize the amorphous silicon layer.

Fonash et al. differ from the claimed invention by not comprising a first thin film transistor provided in a matrix pixel circuit over the substrate, and a second thin film transistor provided in a peripheral driving circuit over the substrate, each of the first and second thin film transistors comprising the crystalline semiconductor island, wherein at

Art Unit: 2815

least one of hydrogen and halogen element is contained at a concentration not higher than $1 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in the monodomain regions of the first and second thin film transistors, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the second thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ to $5 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the first thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ or less.

Sakamoto discloses a semiconductor device (Fig. 2) comprising a first thin film transistor provided in a matrix pixel circuit (thin film transistor formed in the pixel portion or the pixel display portion) over a substrate (71) (col. 7, lines 24-25), and a second thin film transistor provided in a peripheral driving circuit (thin film transistor formed in the peripheral logic and driver circuit) over the substrate.

Since both Fonash et al. and Sakamoto teach a semiconductor device, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the thin film transistor disclosed by Fonash et al. can be used to form an integrated circuit as disclosed by Sakamoto, because the combined semiconductor device can be formed at a relatively low temperature requiring a relatively short annealing time and can be used in a display device. In this case, each of the first and second thin film transistors comprises the crystalline semiconductor island disclosed by Fonash et al.

Further regarding claim 87, Fonash et al. in view of Sakamoto differ from the claimed invention by not showing that at least one of hydrogen and halogen element is contained at a concentration not higher than $1 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in the monodomain regions of the first and second thin film transistors, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of

Art Unit: 2815

the second thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ to $5 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the first thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ or less.

It would have been obvious, if not inherent, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that hydrogen is contained at a concentration not higher than $1 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in the monodomain regions of the first and second thin film transistors due to contamination during deposition of the semiconductor layer and annealing, because hydrogen is a common contaminant during a semiconductor processing in an air ambient or vacuum, and can diffuse through insulating or metal layers, and also a concentration of hydrogen should be controlled to achieve a desired mobility for the thin film transistors. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors may include nickel at a concentration in the claimed ranges, because a concentration of nickel can be controlled to form high quality crystalline semiconductor islands, while reducing adverse effects caused by nickel, there is a *vertical variation* of a nickel concentration in the crystalline semiconductor islands, especially because Fonash et al. disclose that the uppermost surface 18 of the polycrystalline silicon layer is not affected by nickel (col. 2, lines 59-62), and Applicants do not *specifically* claim that nickel concentration profiles are different between the two crystalline semiconductor islands. Further regarding claim 87, the claim is *prima facie* obvious without showing that the claimed ranges of the hydrogen and nickel concentrations achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art

Art Unit: 2815

range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art) and *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

Regarding claims 88 and 90, Fonash et al. in view of Sakamoto further disclose that each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors comprises Ni (claim 88), and each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors is a silicon island (claim 90).

Regarding claim 123, Fonash et al. disclose a semiconductor device (Fig. 1) comprising a thin film transistor over a substrate (Glass substrate) comprising a crystalline semiconductor island (col. 2, lines 40-41 and 63-66, and col. 3, lines 1-6), source and drain regions in the crystalline semiconductor island (col. 3, lines 22-27), a channel forming region (center portion of Poly Si) between the source and drain regions, a gate insulating film (SiO₂) adjacent to at least the channel forming region, and a gate electrode (Gate) adjacent to the channel forming region having the gate insulating film therebetween, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the thin film transistor is formed in a monodomain region which contains no grain boundary, because the nickel layer 12 is formed at a bottom surface of an amorphous silicon layer

Art Unit: 2815

to crystallize the amorphous silicon layer and can be patterned as isolated islands (col. 3, lines 1-6) and thus would not have grain boundaries shown in Fig. 2 of current Application, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the thin film transistor includes nickel, because nickel in the nickel layer 12 would diffuse into the amorphous silicon layer during annealing to crystallize the amorphous silicon layer.

Fonash et al. differ from the claimed invention by not comprising a first thin film transistor provided in a matrix pixel circuit over the substrate, and a second thin film transistor provided in a peripheral driving circuit over the substrate, each of the first and second thin film transistors comprising the crystalline semiconductor island, wherein each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors includes carbon and nitrogen at a concentration not higher than $5 \times 10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, wherein each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors includes at least one of hydrogen and halogen element at a concentration not higher than $1 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in the monodomain region, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the second thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ to $5 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the first thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ or less.

Sakamoto discloses a semiconductor device (Fig. 2) comprising a first thin film transistor provided in a matrix pixel circuit (thin film transistor formed in the pixel portion or the pixel display portion) over a substrate (71) (col. 7, lines 24-25), and a second thin film transistor provided in a peripheral driving circuit (thin film transistor formed in the peripheral logic and driver circuit) over the substrate.

Since both Fonash et al. and Sakamoto teach a semiconductor device, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the thin film transistor disclosed by Fonash et al. can be used to form an integrated circuit as disclosed by Sakamoto, because the combined semiconductor device can be formed at a relatively low temperature requiring a relatively short annealing time and can be used in a display device. In this case, each of the first and second thin film transistors comprises the crystalline semiconductor island disclosed by Fonash et al.

Further regarding claim 123, Fonash et al. in view of Sakamoto differ from the claimed invention by not showing that each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors includes carbon and nitrogen at a concentration not higher than $5 \times 10^{18} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, wherein each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors includes at least one of hydrogen and halogen element at a concentration not higher than $1 \times 10^{20} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ in the monodomain region, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the second thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ to $5 \times 10^{17} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, wherein the crystalline semiconductor island of the first thin film transistor includes nickel at a concentration of $1 \times 10^{16} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ or less.

It would have been obvious, if not inherent, to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that concentrations of carbon, nitrogen and hydrogen in the crystalline semiconductor islands disclosed by Fonash et al. in view of Sakamoto may be within the claimed ranges, because carbon, nitrogen and hydrogen are common contaminants during a semiconductor processing in an air ambient or vacuum, and can

Art Unit: 2815

diffuse through insulating or metal layers, and also concentrations of carbon, nitrogen and hydrogen should be controlled to achieve a desired mobility for the thin film transistors. Also, it would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art at the time the invention was made that the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors may include nickel at a concentration in the claimed ranges, because a concentration of nickel can be controlled to form high quality crystalline semiconductor islands, while reducing adverse effects caused by nickel, there is a *vertical variation* of a nickel concentration in the crystalline semiconductor islands, especially because Fonash et al. disclose that the uppermost surface 18 of the polycrystalline silicon layer is not affected by nickel (col. 2, lines 59-62), and Applicants do not *specifically* claim that nickel concentration profiles are different between the two crystalline semiconductor islands. Further regarding claim 123, the claim is *prima facie* obvious without showing that the claimed ranges of carbon, nitrogen, hydrogen and nickel concentrations achieve unexpected results relative to the prior art range. *In re Woodruff*, 16 USPQ2d 1935, 1937 (Fed. Cir. 1990). See also *In re Huang*, 40 USPQ2d 1685, 1688 (Fed. Cir. 1996) (claimed ranges of a result effective variable, which do not overlap the prior art ranges, are unpatentable unless they produce a new and unexpected result which is different in kind and not merely in degree from the results of the prior art). See also *In re Boesch*, 205 USPQ 215 (CCPA) (discovery of optimum value of result effective variable in known process is ordinarily within skill of art) and *In re Aller*, 105 USPQ 233 (CCPA 1955) (selection of optimum ranges within prior art general conditions is obvious).

Regarding claims 124 and 126, Fonash et al. in view of Sakamoto further disclose that each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors comprises Ni (claim 124), and each of the crystalline semiconductor islands of the first and second thin film transistors is a silicon island (claim 126).

Double Patenting

7. The nonstatutory double patenting rejection is based on a judicially created doctrine grounded in public policy (a policy reflected in the statute) so as to prevent the unjustified or improper timewise extension of the “right to exclude” granted by a patent and to prevent possible harassment by multiple assignees. A nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting rejection is appropriate where the conflicting claims are not identical, but at least one examined application claim is not patentably distinct from the reference claim(s) because the examined application claim is either anticipated by, or would have been obvious over, the reference claim(s). See, e.g., *In re Berg*, 140 F.3d 1428, 46 USPQ2d 1226 (Fed. Cir. 1998); *In re Goodman*, 11 F.3d 1046, 29 USPQ2d 2010 (Fed. Cir. 1993); *In re Longi*, 759 F.2d 887, 225 USPQ 645 (Fed. Cir. 1985); *In re Van Ornum*, 686 F.2d 937, 214 USPQ 761 (CCPA 1982); *In re Vogel*, 422 F.2d 438, 164 USPQ 619 (CCPA 1970); and *In re Thorington*, 418 F.2d 528, 163 USPQ 644 (CCPA 1969).

A timely filed terminal disclaimer in compliance with 37 CFR 1.321(c) or 1.321(d) may be used to overcome an actual or provisional rejection based on a nonstatutory double patenting ground provided the conflicting application or patent either is shown to

Art Unit: 2815

be commonly owned with this application, or claims an invention made as a result of activities undertaken within the scope of a joint research agreement.

Effective January 1, 1994, a registered attorney or agent of record may sign a terminal disclaimer. A terminal disclaimer signed by the assignee must fully comply with 37 CFR 3.73(b).

Claims 87, 88, 90, 123, 124 and 126 are rejected on the ground of nonstatutory obviousness-type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 of U.S. Patent No. 5,614,733 in view of Nakagawa et al. (US 4,766,477). Although the conflicting claims are not identical, they are not patentably distinct from each other because the differences between claims 87, 88, 90, 123, 124 and 126 of current Application and claims 1-4, 6, 8, 9 and 11 of Zhang et al. (US 5,614,733) are limitations of (i) "each of said crystalline semiconductor islands" "is formed in a monodomain region which contains no grain boundary" and (ii) recited upper limits of concentrations of hydrogen and/or halogen element, carbon and nitrogen. The concentrations of hydrogen, carbon and nitrogen in a thin film transistor are disclosed in Nakagawa et al. to form a semiconductor device having excellent semiconductor properties with high reliability and a good surface roughness (columns 3 and 4). Further, the limitations "a monodomain region" and "grain boundary" are not well-defined and thus can be broadly interpreted to refer to active regions (comprising crystalline semiconductors) claimed in Zhang et al., and Zhang et al. would comprise "a monodomain region" and "no grain boundary" since Zhang et al. discloses substantially identical process to form "a first thin film transistor" and "a second thin film transistor".

Response to Arguments

8. Applicants' arguments with respect to claims 87 and 123 have been considered but are moot in view of the new grounds of rejection.

Conclusion

Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to JAY C. KIM whose telephone number is (571)270-1620. The examiner can normally be reached on 7:30 AM - 5:00 PM EST.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, Kenneth Parker can be reached on (571) 272-2298. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 571-273-8300.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free). If you would like assistance from a USPTO Customer Service Representative or access to the automated information system, call 800-786-9199 (IN USA OR CANADA) or 571-272-1000.

/J. K./
Examiner, Art Unit 2815
December 18, 2010

Application/Control Number: 08/520,079

Page 13

Art Unit: 2815

/Ken A Parker/

Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2815